"This is not charity": The Masculine Work of Strike Relief

Grace Millar

On 19 February 1951, Auckland waterfront workers were locked-out. For the next five months, 2,000 workers and those dependent on their income had to survive without wages. By the end of February, the Auckland branch of the New Zealand Waterside Workers Union (NZWWU) had set up a relief committee to meet members' most urgent needs. The complexity of the relief committee's task was hinted at in the first weeks of the dispute when the lockout newsletter contained this notice for members: "The committee desires to impress on all members that this is not charity. The Distribution of goods to necessitous cases is a responsible, legitimate Trades Union function."[1] A week later, men in the relief depot refused to work alongside women, and women were excluded for the remainder of the dispute. In 1951, the Auckland relief committee prioritised distributing welfare in a way that did not reproduce class-hierarchies, which they did through enforcing gender segregation. The relief committee set up an alternative welfare system under circumstances very much not of their own choosing, circumscribed both by their limited resources and the cultural environment that they operated in.

In New Zealand, as elsewhere, conflict between employers and workers on the waterfront was at a peak in the aftermath of the Second World War.[2] The vast majority of goods that came in or out of New Zealand did so on a ship, and were loaded and unloaded by watersiders (watersiders and wharfies were the local terms for those who worked on the waterfront, rather dockers or longshoremen).[3] The importance of waterfront work had created a militant unionised workforce, which politicians and the press resented and demonised.[4] Therefore, the key struggle over the shape of the post-war industrial landscape in New Zealand was fought on the waterfront. In February 1951, a wage dispute between watersiders and employers escalated, as watersiders refused overtime and in response ship-owners locked out watersiders. The National government took control of the dispute with the goal of breaking the militant NZWWU. Freezing-workers (workers in industrialised meat-

processing, which was a major industry), seamen and coal miners went on strike in support of watersiders. Altogether over 15,000 workers were locked out or on supporting strike for five months.[5] The dispute ended in July 1951 with victory for the government and a defeat for the union; the NZWWU was destroyed. The National party called a snap election in September 1951, fought on its record during the lockout, and was returned to government with an increased majority. The 1951 dispute set up a new post-war order with defined limits on workers' power and cemented National as the natural party of government, but also dispersed militant former waterside workers throughout the workforce.[6] Before it had even ended, unionists were claiming 1951 would be remembered as one of New Zealand's great industrial conflicts, and in the decades that followed ensured this prediction came true.[7]

The 1951 waterfront lockout and supporting strikes were a national dispute; all cities, and almost all towns of any size, had locked-out or striking workers. However, relief was organised locally by union branches. The Auckland relief committee's decisions during the 1951 waterfront lock-out are well documented, unlike other branches, where very little material has survived. Thanks to the diligent work of historian Herbert Roth, union records have survived and include: minutes, a cash-book with details of what was spent over one month and reports of the relief committee.[8] In addition, in February 1951, Cabinet passed emergency regulations that criminalised a range of union activity, including providing relief to watersiders. The regulations were widely flouted, but greatly increased the available records of relief activity through the records of police investigations after police files relating to 1951 were made available to researchers in 2008.[9] The union and police sources provide detailed information about how relief was provided and what was distributed. The 1951 waterfront dispute has also been well served by oral history interviews and these provide information on how union members experienced, remembered (or forgot) and told stories about the relief they received.[10] The breadth of sources available about the Auckland relief committee allows the decisions it made to be studied in greater depth than relief committees elsewhere.

Unions have used a range of strategies to ensure that members could survive without wages when they were on strike or locked-out. In different disputes, unions have distributed money, made food parcels, soup kitchens, sent children to other areas and set up camps.[11] In 1974, Peter Cochran wrote a history of a coal strike in Wonthaggi, Australia that focused on relief efforts. He demonstrated how marginal relief work was to strike histories by describing his work as "not an orthodox strike study."[12] Forty years later, far more has been written, but the topic is still more often mentioned in passing than discussed in-depth in histories of industrial disputes.[13] Historical work that does look at relief work in any detail has tended to either look at the sources of funding or questions about women's experiences and gender.

In the 1970s, there was a substantial industrial relations debate in Britain about how strikes were funded, in response to conservative attacks on state-welfare for striking workers.[14] Thatcher's government cut these benefits in the early 1980s, which shaped the funding of the 1984/5 British Miners' Strike. Alan Booth and Roger Smith discussed these law changes and argued that private contributions to union relief funds created an alternative non-state form of welfare.[15] Other historians have focused on the cultural aspects of strike donations: Andy Croll argued that in the 1890s British philanthropists and journalists constructed women and children as innocent victims of strikes, who therefore deserved charitable aid and that unionists ended up having to work within this framework.[16] Croll's work demonstrated that union relief could fruitfully be studied in the context of other forms of welfare.

Industrial conflict during the 1980s affected the questions historians asked about women and strikes for decades. In the 1984/5 Miners' Strike, women were involved in both relief committees and Women Against Pit Closure groups and these groups were transformative for many involved.[17] While the British Miners' Strike was the most prominent strike of this period, those who were interested in women's roles wrote about similar experiences, such as in the Arizona Copper strike of 1983.[18] These experiences cast a long shadow, and many studies of women and industrial action in male-dominated industries have explicitly or implicitly searched for parallels.[19] This has led historians to explore women's experiences through questions about gender roles and at times to dismiss women's relief work as not challenging

gender roles.[20] For example, Steffan Morgan minimised the importance of women's work in food kitchens: "In many ways the strike could not have continued without the food kitchens, however it is important to stress that the support group members were initially participating within the confines of established gender definitions."[21] Sue Bruley explicitly evaluated women's experiences in the 1926 Miners' Lockout in Wales in the context of the 1984/5 strike. However, she went beyond the idea of traditional gender roles and examined how the work of communal feeding, a widespread strategy in 1926, changed working-class communities during the strike.[22]

Bruley and Croll's work provide useful ways of looking at union relief: as both work and welfare. In Auckland in 1951, Providing relief was an extraordinary amount of work; 111 men worked as part of the Auckland relief depots. An entire system of depots and sub-depots was established in the first few weeks of the lockout and dismantled five months later.[23] Union relief structures are ephemeral and therefore they reveal their particular historical moment. In Auckland in 1951, relief was distributed as food parcels and through paying bills. A decade earlier or a decade later, or a few thousand kilometres away, and the relief committee would be created in a different cultural context and make different decisions.[24] Work, welfare, gender, and the relationship between the three, were all resettling in the post-war context in 1951 New Zealand. The first Labour government of the 1930s had widened the welfare state considerably. During the Second World War the state had taken increasing control of the economy, wages and prices. Labour was voted out of power in 1949, after fourteen years, but the new National government largely kept the welfare provisions intact.[25] The 1949 election, and the 1951 waterfront dispute itself, both helped establish what work would look like in postwar New Zealand. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, work was unsettled both in terms of the relative power of capital and labour and in terms of gender, where the war had disrupted patterns of gender and work. When the Auckland relief committee defined need, and organised the work of relief, they were making decisions about work, welfare and gender.

Gender and the main relief depot

In February 1951, the relief committee set up their main relief depot in the practice rooms of the union marching band.[26] The women's auxiliary, a support organization for waterfront workers' wives that had been set up the previous year, worked at the relief depot as did other women.[27] Len Gale described his mother, wife and sister going to the relief depot to help out as soon as they heard about the dispute. The Gale family did not have formal ties to the NZWWU, but were politically radical and active.[28] Other areas of union work were not as open to women. The Auckland branch held daily union meetings, but only union members could attend and that boundary was strictly policed.[29] The NZWWU was an entirely male union and therefore these meetings were male spaces.[30] The distribution of union propaganda was illegal and therefore appears to have been largely been organized among pre-existing relationship networks.[31] In the first month of the lockout, relief work was more accessible to women than other union work, which reflects the strong association of the time between women and welfare.

On March 15 1951, men at the central relief depot stopped work, because they objected to the actions of women at the depot:

> Members of the union who were assisting the relief committee had heard statements made by the women that some members were getting more than others. The members were incensed at this and decided that the women were not able to carry out the work required such as lifting sacks of potatoes, etc. and considered that in the interests of unity it would be far better from them not to be there.[32]

The male workers at the relief depot had a meeting and voted to exclude women. The relief committee, a smaller group of four men and two women that made the decisions about relief, supported this decision. There is no record of the opinions of the two women who were members of the relief committee, who continued in that role. The

Women's Auxiliary passed a motion objecting to the relief committee's decision. Neither the relief committee nor the women's auxiliary records survived, but the minutes of the union executive have survived and on Tuesday 20 March they discussed the conflict.[33]

The minuted discussion did not focus on whether or not women were causing dissension, which is not mentioned again, but whether or not women had anything to offer working at the relief depot. Mr Basham, a member of the relief committee, characterized the work of the depot as moving sacks of potatoes, and emphasized that women could not do this work. Mr Williamson, the head of the relief committee, then suggested that women objected to just doing the menial task of making the tea and: "owing to the arduous nature of the other work that the women's tasks had reached the stage of making tea and sitting around."[34] Johnny Mitchell, who had attended the women's auxiliary meeting stated: "the women thought the relief committee was doing a great job but were not prepared to go there just to make the tea."[35] The centre of the discussion was whether women had a role that they could perform for the relief committee beyond making tea, and eventually the special meeting of the executive and heads of committees endorsed the decision to exclude women.

The conflict over women's attendance at the relief depot revolved around the work involved in running a relief committee and how that work was gendered. The relief committee emphasised moving sacks of potatoes and ignored the time that must have been spent creating smaller parcels. The watersiders constructed relief work so that it resembled the work they were used to: waterfront work also involved moving heavy sacks.[36] The men doing relief work, the relief committee and wider union structures all eventually agreed that the work of the central relief depot was men's work and women had nothing of substance to contribute. However, this gendering of work stands in stark contrast to the usual coding of volunteer and welfare labour as women's work. In 1950s New Zealand, welfare work was women's work.[37] Labour historians have rarely studied the work of assembling food parcels, but Bruce Scates demonstrated that during the First World War creating food parcels was constructed as women's work.[38] Relief workers were volunteers, which was also coded female. In the afterword to a special addition about volunteer labour in the Australian journal

Labour History, Alice Kessler-Harris argued that the masculine connotations of worker involved "heavy, muscular activity for pay" and that this feminised volunteer work.[39] Perhaps it was because their work was vulnerable to being seen as women's work that men who worked in the central relief depot policed the boundaries around gender and work vigorously. During the 1951 dispute, distributing food at the Auckland central relief depot was masculine work only because the watersiders decided that it was.

At the central relief depot, men had to pick up their relief – other family members could not do that for them. When some members of the NZWWU were sent to jail, the executive passed the following motion: "Resolved that the central depot deliver rations to wives of men serving prison sentences".[40] The executive created more work for the relief committee rather than allowing women to collect relief from the central relief depot. The decision to exclude women was mostly discussed in terms of the relief depot as a work space, but it was also a decision about what sort of space the welfare depot should be for the men who collected welfare. Mr Williamson said: "that at times crude language was used by the men coming in for relief and they considered that it would be far better for the women not to be there."[41] After March, the main relief depot was operated by men for men and women were excluded to create a space that men were comfortable in.

Those involved in the dispute knew that collecting welfare and charity was women's work. The family benefit, a universal benefit of ten shillings a child, was paid to the mother.[42] Applying for additional aid from the state, or from private charity was also done by women.[43] However, this difference was probably an advantage for the union relief committee – the relief committee wanted to differentiate itself from other forms of welfare. Welfare involved working-class women applying for welfare and middle-class women assessing whether or not they deserved it. The effort the relief committee made to distinguish relief from other forms of welfare, demonstrated that both the relief committee and union members understood that welfare practice upheld both class and gender relationships.[44] If welfare reproduced class relations, then union relief had to be organized differently.

Making Welfare Men's Work

The limited resources of the relief committee made it harder to differentiate union relief from other forms of welfare. The band practice rooms had not been designed to be a relief office. They were busy chaotic places, with up to 700 men collecting relief each week.[45] As well as food parcels, the relief committee paid urgent bills for members.[46] While the band committee rooms functioned well as a food depot, they did not function as well as a space where a worker explained their financial situation to a member of the relief committee. The executive, the relief committee, and members all believed that these interviews should take place in private. In late March, workers were encouraged to take relief with a reassurance about privacy: "all records will be destroyed after the dispute and all matters that are discussed with the members are confidential".[47] Two weeks later the executive discussed the interviews, and stated that congestion in the band room made it difficult for them to be completed satisfactorily. They then passed a motion that all interviews should take place in private.[48] Despite the privacy concerns members of the relief committee did not visit workers in their homes. The decision not to visit workers' homes again shows a strong desire to distance union relief from other forms of welfare. Home visits, and the opportunity they gave for middle-class women to judge working-class women, were an integral part of other welfare systems at this time.[49] The decision to hold interviews about relief in the main depot, even though there was insufficient privacy, reinforced the idea that strike relief was different from other forms of welfare and was provided by men for men.

Workers struggled to ask for relief and assess their families' need; they did not normally do this work. Men's reluctance to take relief was discussed in executive meetings and members' meetings. The Union newsletter included the exhortation: "So if you require assistance, don't let stupid false pride prevent you from obtaining it. Contact the Relief Committee immediately."[50] Despite the efforts of the relief committee, men continued to see avoiding relief as a virtue. Ray Stratton wrote to the union in July:

> In all that time I never drew a penny from the union in any shape or form, indeed at the beginning I took 19/6d worth of groceries along to the depot from self help. Soon afterwards I had my seaman son and his wife to keep and baby. Then also we gave a roof and tucker to stranded seamen for a time, some weeks, at our desire, all gratis of course. At first, in order to help you, I could not let my son draw on your rations, but he did so afterwards.[51]

Tom Gregory did use the relief depot during the dispute, and his ambivalence about it is clear in the way he tells his oral history:

> We used to battle along. But if I needed anything I'd get it. I used to bring home things – some meat sometimes you'd get it – something like that. […] You never turned anything down in trades hall – someone would come down with say a sack of lemons or something like that – or onions or something like that and you'd be in and take it home.[52]

Part of the way through his narrative Gregory switched from 'I' to the more distant 'you'. He also emphasised aid from fellow workers rather than from the relief committee. Other workers avoided discussing relief entirely in their oral history interviews.[53] Watersiders minimised the relief they received in their oral histories, which can be frustrating to a researcher who is interested in that question, but provided important insight into how they saw relief. The welfare system that the relief committee was trying to avoid constructed welfare as incompatible with breadwinning masculinity, and the relief committee could not avoid this association entirely through the way it organised.

Requiring men to ask for welfare changed roles within families. In most families before the dispute, men's responsibility for meeting their families' needs ended when they handed over wages to their wives.[54] Some women were dissatisfied with their husband's attitude towards relief. Doreen Hewitt said: "One time he [her husband Jimmy Hewitt] came home and he said "oh they were giving out chickens." […] Jim said to give them to people who deserve them".[55] Doreen Hewitt would have appreciated one of the chickens, but had to rely on her husband's assessment of their need. Ron S. spent his days organising relief, but did not take any for his family of four children, because he thought other people needed it more. His wife disagreed.[56] Ron S. did not just refuse to take union relief, he continued to make decisions about what would happen with money that was given to him for his family: "My relations – my father's cousins she gave me ten pounds […] "I'm not giving this to you for the union – I'm giving this to your wife." You know what I done? I gave her £4 I gave the union £5 and I kept one for myself. And she really gets very hot over this".[57] His wife still resented this decision over thirty years later. Men were not necessarily very good at assessing their families' needs and asking for more: that was women's work.

The relief committee set up a simulacrum of the breadwinner; men brought food home to their families, just as they had brought wages home before the dispute. This decision was a good fit with the NZWWU's strong advocacy for a breadwinner wage.[58] However, this decision had consequences. The union was aware that unionists' wives needed to support the strike and men who wanted to withdraw from the dispute made euphemistic references to 'domestic troubles'.[59] The relief committee made no effort to talk to watersiders' wives or listen to their assessment of family needs. The relief committee was hemmed in – it could not directly address women's concerns without breaking with the breadwinner wage system.

Defining Need

The decision to provide food parcels collectivised the work of shopping, which was normally women's work.[60] The decision to exclude women from the central relief depot restricted women's ability to give feedback to the relief committee. It is possible that providing feedback on what to buy was one of the roles of the two

watersiders' wives who worked with the relief committee. Women were still responsible for turning the food provided as part of the food parcels into meals. Very few women whose husbands were involved in the dispute have had their experiences recorded. The only one who explicitly discussed food parcels was Flora Andersen, whose husband was locked out from the Auckland wharf: "Yeah well I don't know what organisation it was, but we used to get a handful of – um – bits of things in. We never really got the things that were necessary – like we didn't get eggs or meat – occasionally we got a bit of meat".[61] Her account shows the lack of connection between the relief committee and the women who were preparing meals with the food provided. Andersen does not remember the organisation, but does remember her dissatisfaction with the food they selected.

Enough records survive to give a rough estimate of what the relief committee distributed. These records generally reflect Andersen's memories of the relief she received. The relief committee provided: vegetables, meat, butter, bread and other groceries.[62] Butter was central to the relief committee's food strategy; they spent £103/10/8 on butter on 27 April, and then another £73/10/0 a week later.[63] Butter was an important part of New Zealanders' diet at the time and its cultural meaning was more significant than its role as a fat. Frances Steel argued that butter was central to New Zealand's image of itself as a land of affluence.[64] The relief committee provided approximately half a pound of a week of butter per person, which was the equivalent of the butter ration, until rationing was lifted in 1950.[65] The Auckland relief committee also put considerable effort into purchasing and butchering meat.[66] In total, the relief committee bought four and half pounds of meat for every pound of butter it bought, the same ratio as the rationing system. [67] The relief committee's job may have been made easier as the rationing system, which had only just ended, was a common touchstone of the necessities of life that both watersiders and their families would have been familiar with. Not all the relief committee's decisions about food are as easy to understand. The most mysterious decision the Auckland relief committee made was their purchase of tea. The final report of the relief committee claimed that they bought 48,939 pounds of tea.[68] This is more than the total weight purchased of butter and cheese combined, which suggests that the relief committee was open to either whims or errors.

The Auckland relief committee defined working-class families' needs when it decided what bills to pay through personal relief. From 17 April to 16 May 1951, the relief committee provided grants of about £750 for 157 watersiders (out of 2,000 members).[69] For the period of which records survived, 68 per cent of grants to individuals went on housing and another 14 per cent on energy. These were very partial payments; the relief committee only paid accounts when absolutely necessary after it had attempted to negotiate credit from landlords and power companies. The relief committee also granted money for a small number of health needs: there are entries that are marked 'wife's treatment', 'anti-tetanus injection', 'orange juice for diet', 'milk diet' and 'doctor's visit'. The other identifiable payments the relief committee made were to repay members' existing debt.[70] One payment is labelled 'layby credit' and another 'sewing machine' these were probably made to ensure that goods on hire purchase were not repossessed. The relief committee was required to define relief very narrowly, due to its limited resources. Decisions on personal relief were significantly influenced by the need to ensure workers did not abandon the dispute because of a financial crisis.

The grants given out for personal relief show the relief committee saw the needs of single men different from married men. Four watersiders had their board, rather than their rent, paid for. Boarding houses were a reasonably common accommodation option for single men in this period.[71] Another four watersiders received payments for meals, even though the relief committee usually met members' need for sustenance for food parcels. One watersider, W. Gee, received three payments totalling three pounds seven shillings for his housekeeper.[72] The relief committee paid for women's home labour as a necessity that was part of meeting single men's accommodation costs. Providing food parcels was a system of relief for married men, who had wives to turn those groceries into meals. The way the relief committee met both single and married men's needs demonstrated the committee's reliance on married women's domestic labour, even though those same women were marginalised from relief structures.

Personal relief and food were the forms of aid that the relief committee put major resources into, but they were not the only forms of aid they provided. The relief

committee also provided boot mending and barbering for union members in the central relief depot.[73] These services were provided by members who had skills in these areas. In April, the union executive passed a new policy that the "only shoes to be repaired should be those in constant use."[74] This policy was to ensure that workers did not take advantage of the service, although it is not clear how they might have done so, perhaps by getting all their shoes fixed at once, or something more explicit like bringing friends boots in for a fee. These services acted as acknowledgement that men had personal needs and that the union had a responsibility to meet them collectively.

Peripheral relief structures

The main relief depot was the centre of the NZWWU Auckland branch's efforts to ensure that locked out workers had the resources to survive, but it was not the only place that resources were provided. Only about half of those that collected relief did so from the main depot. The other half collected from thirteen sub-depots that were scattered around Auckland in suburbs where watersiders lived.[75] This decision was explained in the relief committee's final report: "[sub-depots were] regarded as more efficient, and reduced the burden of transport costs from the more distant suburbs into town".[76] Sub-depots allowed the relief committee to provide food parcels to members living across Auckland's newly sprawling suburbs.

The hall that the Watersiders Brass Band practiced in was the only empty space that the relief committee had access to. Sub-depots were set-up in the suburban homes of members and supporters.[77] The main depot was on a busy main thoroughfare, but the sub-depots were on quiet side-streets and dead-end roads. Each sub-depot served about 65 people, which would have been a substantial number of visitors to a suburban home. These suburban homes did not necessarily have much spare space. The Watene family's three-bedroom house became the Panmure sub-depot, even though it housed two adults and eight children.[78] The relief committee saw homes as less private than the main relief depot. Towards the end of the dispute the executive considered interviewing men who were seeking personal relief in the sub-depots, but ruled it out as there would be insufficient privacy.[79] As a result, the

sub-depots only provided food; the other activities of the relief committee were carried out in the main depot.

The relief committee did not attempt to turn the houses that hosted the sub-depots into masculine workspaces, as they had at the main relief depot. At the main depot men worked a full working week, complete with lunch-breaks. At one point there was conflict about the opening hours at the main depot and the relief committee used the normal working week as an explanation for their actions.[80] The sub-depots had limited opening hours; the Ponsonby sub-depot, which was in a small villa on a quiet street, was open between 1 and 3pm Monday, Wednesday and Friday.[81] These hours were presumably chosen to fit around other household activities. Union work could not stop a home from being a domestic space and therefore the sub-depots could not be turned into masculine workspaces.

There is conflicting evidence about who worked at these sub-depots. The relief committee report states that there were four or five workers per sub-depot and refers to these workers as 'men'. However, Lully Watene Heemi, whose house was used as a sub-depot stated: "They were people you know – the wives of um they took turns at doing that – you know they were waterfront workers' wives and families that knew the families that were coming to get the food."[82] Her evidence suggests that women both distributed and collected relief from her house. There is no further evidence about how the sub-depots operated. It seems most likely that Watene Heemi's memory is accurate and that work at sub-depots were not as strictly policed as the main depots.

The houses that temporarily became sub-depots during the dispute were and remained domestic spaces. Relief was not the only union work that took place in workers' homes during the lockout. Propaganda making took place within workers' homes, because it was criminalised.[83] Those involved in propaganda making regularly told their stories in the decades after the dispute ended. In these narratives, women frequently take control of their domestic space in the face of both union workers and police searches, by making cups of tea, protecting sleeping children, and the strategic placement of aprons.[84] It is unfortunate that there is little evidence of how family

members and those collecting and distributing relief negotiated the tensions of completing those tasks in a domestic space. The union needed control of a space, as it had control of the band practice rooms, to organise a welfare system that did not reproduce class differences. When operating out of union members homes' the domestic spaces they were operating in could not be reshaped in the same way.

The Auckland Women's Auxiliary had an on-going role in welfare during the dispute, even though its members were banned from the main depot. They provided layettes for women who gave birth and also organised clothes swaps to provide clothes for older children.[85] The Women's Auxiliary organised a trip to the movies for watersiders' children that provided one afternoon of what was for many families a weekly event before the lockout.[86] There were twenty long, increasingly cold and wet Saturdays during the dispute and film-going had a role in working-class families beyond providing children with pleasure – taking children out of the house relieved pressure from their mothers.[87] The Women's Auxiliary records have not survived, so not all of their welfare activities have not been fully recorded, but those that have involved providing for children. During the lockout, the main relief committee marginalised watersiders' wives and the Women's Auxiliary only met their needs as mothers. No-one attempted to conceptualise, let alone meet working-class women's needs. This lack of imagination was partly the result of other decisions to create male-only spaces, but it also speaks to how austere working-class families' lives were and how little money there was to meet non-wage earners' needs.

Some evidence suggests that the Women's Auxiliary operated in a way that reflected other welfare organisations of the time. Melanie Nolan interviewed Betty Allen, a woman who received aid from the Women's Auxiliary. Allen was a young mother: "Allen recalled that the Auxiliary deputation that came to inspect her home were shocked, 'the large woman' observing 'so this is how the other half lives'. 'Well the committee swung into action!" Allen described receiving food, assistance with the rent and furniture from the committee: "Above all, she remembered that when the Auxiliary called her in to get some baby clothes, the woman tossed her a baby girls' bonnet. It was wonderfully made and made Betty cry. She had never expected to be able to dress her little one in anything 'so beautiful'."[88] Both the home visit and the

distinction between those giving and receiving aid are reminiscent of other welfare activities of the 1950s, rather than anything undertaken by the main relief committee. While scant evidence survives about the welfare activity of the Women's Auxiliary, the material that does suggests that it was not constrained in the same way that the relief committee was: working-class women were used to asking for and receiving aid.

Conclusion

The men who worked at the relief depot had clear ideas about gender and work culture. The executive's discussion about excluding women suggests the fragility of masculine workspaces, the threat of women's presence and the inflexibility of both of these in 1950s New Zealand. The main relief depot could not be a place for men to work if women were there. The relief depot was particularly vulnerable, because welfare was normally women's work, and the exclusion of women shows how far the executive had to go to ensure that men were prepared to work there. This suggests that a masculine work-culture was more important to these men than masculine work. They would rather perform women's work, than work with women. The 1951 waterfront dispute is widely recognised as a key part of negotiating post-war industrial relations in New Zealand. The decision to gender segregate relief work shows the importance of gender-segregated work-cultures to working-class men, in the 1950s, after the disruption to gendered work patterns during war.

The Auckland relief committee was welfare run by working-class men, for working-class men. Their records demonstrate that working-class men understood the relationship between class, gender and welfare perpetuated by mainstream welfare organizations and they were determined not to replicate it. The Auckland relief committee attempted to provide members with relief in a way that reproduced class awareness on their terms and they did so by excluding women. Although excluding women ensured men were prepared to continue doing welfare work, the union relief committee was never entirely successful in recasting the class and gender dynamics of welfare sufficiently to make their members wholly comfortable in collecting relief. This shows the inflexibility of working-class men's cultural understanding of welfare

in 1950s New Zealand. Much had changed about New Zealand's welfare system during the previous fifteen years, and state welfare had moved towards entitlement rather than charity.[89] The strength of working-class men's antipathy towards relief is supported by other historical work, which emphasise change rather than continuity in New Zealand's welfare history.[90]

These conclusions are about gender, work and welfare are historically situated in immediate post-war New Zealand. Union relief committee's ephemeral nature makes them revealing of the specific historical moment they were created under. More generally, union relief committees all operate under similar challenges that could lead to useful comparative discussion. The first and most obvious common factor is that they are almost always trying to replace wages with far fewer resources than would do this adequately. The decisions about what sort of relief to provide are often material ones – structured by the resources that a union has access to. One of the effects of union's limited resources is that relief committees tend to operate in repurposed spaces. During the 1935 Minneapolis Teamsters strike: "Almost every evening, around 11 o'clock, prostitutes arrived at strike headquarters [….] To conceal this from the auxiliary, the strike committee imposed an 11pm curfew on women volunteers."[91] This example suggests that the fraught nature of gender and space during the 1951 waterfront dispute was not unique. A historiography of union relief could explore relief spaces as sites of conflict, as places whose borders were strictly policed, as spaces of liberation and as spaces that operated in ways that historians have not yet uncovered.

Union relief involves working-class people making decisions about gender, welfare and work under pressured circumstances. Histories of welfare, charity and philanthropy are heavy with the views of the middle class distributors of welfare. Union relief committees that were created and run by working-class people provide a different perspective on welfare. In addition, in working-class cultures where it is a man's role to earn money and a woman's role to manage that money, union relief during strikes and lock-outs affects and redefines both these roles. Studies of other industrial disputes suggests that the 1951 relief committee was not alone in its use of

male labour to provide food and that any work, including soup kitchen cooking, could be performed by men.[92] Working-class people generally control union relief committees. Therefore, if examples where adequate sources were available were studied carefully, they could help reveal working-class perspectives on what was flexible and what was rigid about welfare, gender and class.

[1] Emphasis in original, 'Auckland Watersiders Information Bulletin', No. 5, 5 March 1951, 94-106-10/07, Herbert Roth Papers, Alexander Turnbull Library (ATL).
[2] Anna Green, *British Capital, Antipodean Labour: Working the New Zealand Waterfront, 1915-1951*, Dunedin, 2001, pp.131-49. For comparisons with other areas that saw high levels of conflict in this period see: Colin Davis, *Waterfront Revolts: New York and London Dockworkers, 1946-61*, Urbana, 2003.
[3] *New Zealand Official Yearbook 1950*, 1951, Statistics New Zealand Digitised Yearbooks Collection.
[4] Green, *British Capital, Antipodean Labour*.
[5] Department of Labour, Strike Return summary, 1951, (R397500), AANK-W3285-7, Labour Department Library Various Files, Archives New Zealand Wellington Office (ANZ-WO).
[6] Michael Bassett, *Confrontation '51: The 1951 Waterfront Dispute*, Wellington, 1972, pp.196-212; Pat Walsh, 'The Legacy of '51,' in David Grant (ed.), *The Big Blue: Snapshots of the 1951 Waterfront Lockout*, Christchurch, 2004.
[7] For example, 'Freezing Workers Strike Bulletin', 14 May 1951, 94-106-39/03, Roth Papers, ATL; John Milne, 'Will the 1951 Siege on Trade Unionism Happen Again?', *The Public Service Journal*, 65, 1, 1978; Rona Bailey, 'Where Have All the Stories Gone', *The Public Service Journal*, 73, 1986; Eddie, '1951 It Ain't for Now', *The Standard*, 16 January 2012, available at: http://thestandard.org.nz/1951-it-aint-for-now/ accessed 7 February 2013; 'Talk on 1951 Waterfront Lockout – and What's Happening Today', *Redline: Contemporary Marxist Analysis*, 4 March 2012, available at: http://rdln.wordpress.com/2012/03/04/talk-on-1951-waterfront-dispute-and-whats-happening-today/ accessed 8 February 2013.
[8] Auckland Watersiders Relief Committee, Cashbook, 1951, 94-106-11/05; NZWWU Auckland Branch, Minutes, 1951, 94-106-11/01; Relief Committee, Auckland Branch, NZWWU, 'Report', 1951, 94-106-11/06, Roth Papers, ATL.
[9] NZPA, 'Secret 1951 Waterfront Strike Files Released', *The National Business Review Website*, 3 March 2008, available at: http://www.nbr.co.nz/article/secret-1951-waterfront-strike-files-released.
[10] There are over 50 oral history interviews with people who were involved in the dispute in the ATL, smaller collections in the Huntly Museum and in private hands, and I completed a project of 20 interviews for this research.
[11] For example, Howard Zinn, Dana Frank, and Robin Kelley, *Three Strikes: Miners, Musicians, Salesgirls, and the Fighting Spirit of Labor's Last Century*, Boston, 2002; Theresa Moriarty, '"Who Will Look after the Kiddies?" Households and Collective Action During the Dublin Lockout, 1913,' in Jan Kok (ed.), *Rebellious Famlies: Household Strategies and Collective Action in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, New York, 2002; Andrea Hotere, 'The 1951 Waterfront Lockout in Port Chalmers', BA(Hons) thesis, University of Otago, 1989, p.99; Sue Bruley, 'The Politics of Food: Gender, Family, Community and Collective Feeding in South Wales in the General Strike and Miners' Lockout of 1926', *Twentieth Century British History* 18:1, 2007.
[12] Peter Cochrane, 'The Wonthaggi Coal Strike, 1934', *Labour History* 27, 1974.
[13] Examples of recent histories of industrial disputes that only mention relief in passing include: John Tully, '"Nothing but Rebels": Union Sisters at the Sydney Rubber Works, 1918-42', *Labour History* 103, 2012; Paul Robert Adams and Erik Eklund, 'Representing Militancy: Photographs of the Broken Hill Industrial Disputes, 1908-20', *Labour History* 101, 2011; Jeremy Milloy, 'A Battle Royal: Service Work Activism and the 1961-1962 Royal York Strike', *Labour/Le Travail* 58, 2006. Examples of recent histories of industrial disputes that do not mention relief at all include: Laurel Sefton

MacDowell, 'The Elliot Lake Uranium Miners' Battle to Gain Occupational Health and Safety Improvements, 1950–1980', *Labour/Le Travail* 69, 2012; Horssen Jessica van, '"À Faire Un Peu De Poussière:" Environmental Health and the Asbestos Strike of 1949', *Labour/Le Travail* 70, 2012; Sheila Cohen, 'Equal Pay – or What? Economics, Politics and the 1968 Ford Sewing Machinists' Strike', *Labor History* 53:1, 2012; William Suarez-Potts, 'The Railroad Strike of 1927: Labor and Law after the Mexican Revolution', *Labor History* 52:4, 2011; Charles Fahey and John Lack, '"Silent Forms of Coercion": Welfare Capitalism, State Labour Regulation and Collective Action at the Yarraville Sugar Refinery, 1890-1925', *Labour History* 101, 2011; William Brucher, 'From the Picket Line to the Playground: Labor, Environmental Activism, and the International Paper Strike in Jay, Maine', *Labor History* 52:1, 2011; John Peters, 'Down in the Vale: Corporate Globalization, Unions on the Defensive, and the USW Local 6500 Strike in Sudbury, 2009-2010', *Labour/Le Travail* 66, 2010; Ian Milligan, '"The Force of All Our Numbers": New Leftists, Labour, and the 1973 Artistic Woodwork Strike', *Labour/Le Travail* 66, 2010; Sam Davies, '"A Whirling Vortex of Women": The Strikes of Scots Herring Women in East Anglia in the 1930s and 1940s', *Labour History Review* 75:2, 2010.

[14] W. J. Cole, 'The Financing of the Individual Strikers: A Case Study in the Building Industry', *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 1, 1975; J. Durcan and W. McCarthy, 'The State Subsidy Theory of Strikes an Examination of Statistical Data for the Period 1956-1970', *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 12, 1974; John Gennard, *Financing Strikers*, London, 1977; John Gennard, 'The Effects of Strike Acitivity on Households', *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 19:3, 1981; Roger Lasko, 'The Payment of Supplementary Benefit for Strikers' Dependents-Misconception and Misrepresentation', *Modern Law Review* 38, 1975.

[15] Alan Booth and Roger Smith, 'The Irony of the Iron Fist: Social Security and the Coal Dispute 1984-85', *Journal of Law and Society* 12:3, 1985. See also: Diarmaid Kelliher, 'Solidarity and Sexuality: Lesbians and Gays Support the Miners 1984–5', *History Workshop Journal* 77:1, 2014; Lesley Sutcliffe and Brian Hill, *Let Them Eat Coal: The Political Use of Social Security During the Miners' Strike*, London, 1985.

[16] Andy Croll, 'Starving Strikers and the Limits of the "Humanitarian Discovery of Hunger" in Late Victorian Britain', *International Review of Social History* 56:1, 2011.

[17] This interpretation of the Women Against Pit Closures groups has since been challenged by historians who emphasise the previous political activities and awareness of those involved in the groups, Jean Spence and Carol Stephenson, '"Side by Side with Our Men?" Women's Activism, Community, and Gender in the 1984–1985 British Miners' Strike', *International Labor and Working-Class History* 75:1, 2009. However, the contemporary interpretation of women's experiences in the 1984-5 miner's strike is what made such an impact on the historiography.

[18] Judy Aulette and Trudy Mills, 'Something Old, Something New: Auxiliary Work in the 1983-1986 Copper Strike', *Feminist Studies* 14:2, 1988; Barbara Kingsolver, *Holding the Line: Women in the Great Arizona Mine Strike of 1983*, Ithaca, 1996.

[19] Meg Luxton, 'From Ladies Auxiliaries to Wives' Committees: Housewives and the Unions,' in Meg Luxton, et al. (eds), *Through the Kitchen Window: The Politics of Home and Family*, Toronto, 1986; Marjorie Lasky, '"Where I Was a Person": The Ladies' Auxiliary in the 1934 Minneapolis Teamsters' Strikes,' in Ruth Milkman (ed.), *Women, Work & Protest: A Century of U.S. Labor History*, New York, 1985.

[20] Ruth Milkman, *Women, Work, and Protest: A Century of U.S. Women's Labor History*, New York, 1987, p.181.

[21] Steffan Morgan, '"Stand by Your Man": Wives, Women and Feminism During the Miners' Strike, 1984-85', *Llafur: Journal of Welsh Labour History/Cylchgrawn Hanes Llafur Cymru* 9:2, 2005.

[22] Sue Bruley, 'The Politics of Food: Gender, Family, Community and Collective Feeding in South Wales in the General Strike and Miners' Lockout of 1926', *Twentieth Century British History*, 18:1, 2007, pp.54-77.

[23] ' Report', Relief Committee, New Zealand Waterside Workers' Union (Auckland Branch), 94-106-11/06, Roth Papers, ATL.

[24] A year later, in an Australian stay-down strike, very different strategies were used: Georgina Murray and David Peetz, 'Women Miners and Miners' Women: Their Activism in the 1952 Stay-Down Strike', in *Public Sociologies: Lessons and Trans-Tasman Comparisons* Auckland, 2007.

[25] Robert Chapman, 'From Labour to National,' in William Oliver (ed.), *The Oxford History of New Zealand*, Wellington, 1981.
[26] Detective Sergeant R. Jones, Report Relative To: De-registered Waterside Workers' Union Relief Depots – Relief Depot at Beresford Street, Auckland, 21 April 1951, (R10074966), ADMO-21007-W5595/1-25/9/20/1, Restricted Files, ANZ-WO.
[27] Kathryn Parsons, 'The Women's Waterfront Auxiliary', in David Grant, (ed.) *The Big Blue: Snapshots of the 1951 Waterfront Lockout*, Christchurch, 2004, pp.55-8. For more context see: Margo Beasley, 'Soldiers of the Federation: The Women's Committees of the Waterside Workers' Federation of Australia', *Labour History* 81, 2001, pp.109-27.
[28] Len Gale interview with Grace Millar, 19 April 2012, Families and the 1951 Waterfront Dispute Oral History Project.
[29] Len Gale interview with Grace Millar, 19 April 2012, Families and the 1951 Waterfront Dispute Oral History Project.
[30] Two hundred of the freezing workers were women; the rest of the locked-out and striking workers were men. 'Department of Labour Final Return of Strike or Industrial Dispute', 1951, (R397500), AANK-W3285-7, Labour Department Library Various Files, ANZ-WO.
[31] Len Gale interview with Grace Millar, 19 April 2012, Families and the 1951 Waterfront Dispute Oral History Project; Trade Union History Project, 'A Dissenting New Zealand: a Seminar on the Life of Rona Bailey', December 1993, audio recording, OHC-01451; John James Mitchell, interview with Douglas Crosado, Ray Grover and Bert Roth, 1977-1988, OHInt-0219/1, OHC-ATL.
[32] NZWWU Auckland Branch, Minutes of Special Meeting of Executive & Chairmen of Committees, 20 March 1951, 94-106-11/01, Roth Papers, ATL.
[33] NZWWU Auckland Branch, Minutes of Special Meeting of Executive & Chairmen of Committees, 20 March 1951, 94-106-11/01, Roth Papers, ATL.
[34] NZWWU Auckland Branch, Minutes of Special Meeting of Executive & Chairmen of Committees, 20 March 1951, 94-106-11/01, Roth Papers, ATL.
[35] NZWWU Auckland Branch, Minutes of Special Meeting of Executive & Chairmen of Committees, 20 March 1951, 94-106-11/01, Roth Papers, ATL.
[36] For a full discussion of waterfront work in this period see: Green, *British Capital, Antipodean Labour*.
[37] Bronwyn Labrum, 'Family Needs and Family Desires: Discretionary State Welfare in New Zealand, 1920-1970', PhD thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, 2000; Margaret Tennant, *The Fabric of Welfare: Voluntary Organisations, Government and Welfare in New Zealand, 1840-2005*, Wellington, 2007.
[38] Bruce Scates, 'The Unknown Sock Knitter: Voluntary Work, Emotional Labour, Bereavement and the Great War', *Labour History*, 81, 2001, pp.29-49.
[39] Alice Kessler-Harris, 'Voluntary Work and Labour History: A Postscript', *Labour History*:81, 2001, p.129.
[40] NZWWU Auckland Branch, Minutes of Special Meeting of Executive & Chairmen of Committees, 31 May 1951, 94-106-11/01, Roth Paper, ATL.
[41] NZWWU Auckland Branch, Minutes of Special Meeting of Executive & Chairmen of Committees, 20 March 1951, 94-106-11/01, Roth Papers, ATL.
[42] Memorandum for: The Secretary of External Affairs Wellington, from B. F. Waters Chairman Social Security Commission, Family Benefit Scheme New Zealand, 16 January 1952, (R17489715), ADBO-16141-W2756-SS7W2756-47/10/5/1, Part 3, [Social Security Department] Head Office registered files, ANZ-WO.
[43] Labrum, 'Family Needs and Family Desires'.
[44] Historians have documented this relationship in a variety of settings: Mark Peel, 'Charity, Casework and the Dramas of Class in Melbourne, 1920-1940: "Feeling Your Position"', *History Australia* 2:3, 2005; Nell Musgrove, 'Private Homes, Public Scrutiny: Surveillance of "the Family" in Post-War Melbourne, 1945-1965', *History Australia* 1:1, 2003; Elizabeth Harvey, 'Philanthropy in Birmingham and Sydney, 1860-1914: Class, Gender and Race', PhD thesis, University College London, 2011; Daniel Walkowitz, *Working with Class: Social Workers and the Politics of Middle-Class Identity*, Chapel Hill, 1999.
[45] E. Williamson, Relief Committee Report, July 1951, 94-106-11/06, Roth Papers, ATL.

[46] NZWWU Auckland Branch, Minutes of Special Members Meeting, 6, 8 March 1951, 94-106-11/01, Roth Papers, ATL.
[47] Luckily for this project this statement was not followed through and some Auckland relief files survived. NZWWU Auckland Branch, Minutes of Special Members Meeting, 22 March 1951, 94-106-11/01, Roth Papers, ATL.
[48] NZWWU Auckland Branch, Minutes of Special Meeting of Executive & Chairmen of Committees, 12 April 1951, 94-106-11/01, Roth Papers, ATL.
[49] Labrum, 'Family Needs and Family Desires'; Musgrove, 'Private Homes, Public Scrutiny'.
[50] 'Auckland Watersiders Information Bulletin', No. 5, 5 March 1951, 94-106-10/07, Roth Papers, ATL.
[51] Ray Stratton to Mr Jones, 23 July 1951, 94-106-11/04, Roth Papers, ATL.
[52] Tom and Pat Gregory interview with Grace Millar, 20 December 2010, Families and the 1951 Waterfront Dispute Oral History Project.
[53] For example: Ted Thompson interview with Kerry Taylor, 1995, OHColl-0861, Trade Union 1951 Oral History Project; Joseph Kereopa interview with Jamie Mackay, 27 February 1992, OHInt-0020/07, Huntly Coalfields Oral History Project; Conan Doyle interview with Hugo Manson, 13 August 1986, OH-Coll-011881, OHC-ATL.
[54] For a fuller discussion of money management in New Zealand working-class families in this period see: Grace Millar, 'Families and the New Zealand 1951 Waterfront Lockout', PhD thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, 2014, pp.43-6.
[55] Doreen Hewitt interview with Gerry Evans, 1 February 2000, author's possession.
[56] Anna Green interview with watersider, mid-1980s. Anna Green gave me access to these interviews on the condition that I do not identify individual interviewees. Further information about her interviewees can be found in her work: Green, *British Capital, Antipodean Labour*.
[57] Anna Green interview with watersider, mid-1980s. Another of Anna Green's interviewees tells a similar story.
[58] Melanie Nolan, ''The Women Were Bloody Marvellous': 1951, Gender and New Zealand Industrial Relations', *Historical Studies in Industrial Relations* 16, 2003, pp.136-7.
[59] NZWWU Auckland Branch, Minutes of Special Members Meeting, 16 March; NZWWU Auckland Branch, Minutes of Special Meeting of Executive & Chairmen of Committees, 25 May 1951, 94-106-11/01; James Parker to R. Jones, [1951]; N. Coole to R. Jones, 5 June 1951, 94-106-11/04, Roth Papers, ATL.
[60] Norah Holland, 'Some Aspects of Home-Making', Master of Home Sciences thesis, University of Otago, 1950, pp.31-47.
[61] Flora Andersen interview with Grace Millar, 17 April 2012, Families and the 1951 Waterfront Dispute Oral History Project.
[62] Detective Sergeant R. Jones, Report Relative To: De-registered Waterside Workers' Union Relief Depots – Relief Depot at Beresford Street, Auckland, 21 April 1951, (R10074966), ADMO-21007-W5595/1-25/9/20/1, Restricted Files, ANZ-WO.
[63] Auckland Watersiders Relief Committee, Cashbook, 1951, Roth Papers, 94-106-11/05, ATL.
[64] Frances Steel, '"New Zealand Is Butterland"', *New Zealand Journal of History* 39:2, 2005, p. 191.
[65] Detective Sergeant R. Jones, Report Relative To: De-registered Waterside Workers' Union Relief Depots – Relief Depot at Beresford Street, Auckland, 21 April 1951, (R10074966), ADMO-21007-W5595/1-25/9/20/1, Restricted Files, ANZ-WO; E. Williamson, Relief Committee Report, July 1951, 94-106-11/06, Roth Papers, ATL; 'The Food Stuff Rationing Coupon Notice 1946', *New Zealand Gazette*, 24 October 1946; 'The Food Stuff Rationing Coupon Notice 1947', *New Zealand Gazette*, 23 October 1947; *New Zealand Official Yearbook 1950*, 1950, Statistics New Zealand Digitised Yearbooks Collection.
[66] NZWWU Auckland Branch, Minutes of Special Meeting of Executive & Chairmen of Committees, 4 April 1951, 94-106-11/01, Roth Papers, ATL; Frank Barnard interview with Shaun Ryan, 8, 9 July 1999, Trade Union Oral History Project, OH-Int-0478/30, OHC-ATL.
[67] E. Williamson, Relief Committee Report, July 1951, Roth Papers, 94-106-11/06, ATL.
[68] E. Williamson, Relief Committee Report, July 1951, 94-106-11/06, Roth Papers, ATL.
[69] Auckland Watersiders Relief Committee, Cashbook, 1951, 94-106-11/05, Roth Papers, ATL.
[70] The exact amount is unclear as the records make it difficult to distinguish between money that was provided as a loan and money that was provided to repay other loans.

[71] Port Chalmers Waterfront Workers' Union, Accident Registers 1949-1951, AG-82 L5, Port Chalmers Waterfront Workers' Industrial Union of Workers Records, Hocken Library.
[72] Auckland Watersiders Relief Committee, Cashbook, 1951, 94-106-11/05, Roth Papers, ATL.
[73] Auckland Waterside Workers Union Executive, Minutes, 9 March 1951, 94-106-11/01, Roth Papers, ATL; Dick Scott, *151 Days: History of the Great Waterfront Lockout and Supporting Strikes, February 15-July 15, 1951*, 50th Anniversary Facsimile Edition edn, Auckland, 2001, p.167.
[74] NZWWU Auckland Branch, Minutes of Special Meeting of Executive & Chairmen of Committees, 12 April 1951, 94-106-11/01, Roth Papers, ATL.
[75] NZWWU Auckland Branch, Minutes of Special Members Meeting, 16 March, 2 April 1951, 94-106-11/01; Relief Committee, Auckland Branch, NZWWU, 'Report', 1951, 94-106-11/06, Roth Papers, ATL.
[76] 'Lessons of the New Zealand Waterfront Dispute of 1951', 1952, 94-106-10/3, Roth Papers, ATL.
[77] Lully Watene Heemi interview with Grace Millar, 18 April 2012, Families and the 1951 Waterfront Dispute Oral History Project; 'Report of Detective Sergeant R. Jones: De-registered Waterside Workers' Union Relief Depots – Relief Depot at Beresford Street' 21 March 1951, (R10074967), ADMO-21007-W5595/1-25/9/20/1, ANZ-WO.
[78] Lully Watene Heemi interview with Grace Millar, 18 April 2012, Families and the 1951 Waterfront Dispute Oral History Project.
[79] NZWWU Auckland Branch, Minutes of Special Meeting of Executive & Chairmen of Committees, 21 June 1951, 94-106-11/01, Roth Papers, ATL.
[80] NZWWU Auckland Branch, Minutes of Special Meeting of Executive & Chairmen of Committees, 14 April 1951, 94-106-11/01, Roth Papers, ATL.
[81] 'Report of Detective Sergeant R. Jones: De-registered Waterside Workers' Union Relief Depots – Relief Depot at Beresford Street' 21 March 1951, (R10074967), ADMO-21007-W5595/1-25/9/20/1, ANZ-WO.
[82] Lully Watene Heemi interview with Grace Millar, 18 April 2012, Families and the 1951 Waterfront Dispute Oral History Project.
[83] See: Rona Bailey, 'Telling the World 'the Other Side of the Story',' in David Grant (ed.), *The Big Blue: Snapshots of the 1951 Waterfront Lockout*, Christchurch, 2004; Dick Scott, *A Radical Writer's Life*, Auckland, 2004.
[84] See: Ted Thompson and Ida Thompson interviews with Cath Kelly, 30 August, 18 October 1990, OhInt-0112/3; Trade Union History Project, 'A Dissenting New Zealand: a seminar on the Life of Rona Bailey', December 1993, audio recording, OHC-01451, OHC-ATL; Len Gale interview with Grace Millar, 19 April 2012, Families and the 1951 Waterfront Dispute Oral History Project.
[85] Auckland Watersiders Relief Committee, Cashbook, 1951, 94-106-11/05; 'Lessons of the New Zealand Waterfront Dispute of 1951', 1952, 94-106-10/3, Roth Papers, ATL.
[86] NZWWU Auckland Branch, Minutes of Special Meeting of Executive & Chairmen of Committees, 29 May 1951, 94-106-11/01, Roth Papers, ATL.
[87] Barbara Brookes, Annabel Cooper, and Robin Law, eds, *Sites of Gender: Women, Men and Modernity in Southern Dunedin, 1890-1939*, Auckland, 2003 p.183.
[88] Melanie Nolan, 'Shattering Dreams About Women in the Lockout,' in David Grant (ed.), *The Big Blue: Snapshots of the 1951 Waterfront Lockout*, Christchurch, 2004, p.75.
[89] James Belich, *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders from the 1880s to the Year 2000*, Auckland, 2001, pp.261-3.
[90] Tennant, *The Fabric of Welfare*.
[91] Lasky, '"Where I Was a Person"', p.197.
[92] Bruley, 'The Politics of Food'; Murray and Peetz, Women Miners and Miners' Women: Their Activism in the 1952 Stay-Down Strike; Cochrane, The Wonthaggi Coal Strike, 1934.